



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

1220 f.7. Molesworth, I.E.N. Letter to the Lord Bishop
of Chester. 1841.



600085892





SECOND EDITION, +

WITH OBSERVATIONS ON THE ANSWERS ATTEMPTED.

17

LETTER

TO THE

LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER,

UPON

CERTAIN SYMPTOMS OF SECTARIAN DESIGNS

IN THE

PASTORAL AID SOCIETY;

AND UPON THE

CATHOLIC, COMPREHENSIVE, AND CHURCH REGULATIONS OF

The Society

FOR PROMOTING THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL

CURATES IN POPULOUS PLACES.

By I. E. N. MOLESWORTH, D.D.

VICAR OF ROCHDALE, LANCASHIRE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL;

J. BURNS, PORTMAN STREET;

AND SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1841.

Price Sixpence.

1277

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.



INTRODUCTION.

THE occasion of the following pages arose from the writer having been requested to take part, on the 3rd of December, in a Meeting on behalf of "THE SOCIETY TO PROMOTE THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CURATES." He felt that he could not do justice to the claims of that Society, as a Churchman, if he confined himself to the statement of its usefulness, and its liberal and honourable regulations. To show the pressing necessity for *further* support being promptly given to it, the comparative superiority of it over the Pastoral Aid Society ought to be regarded, and still more the obstacles which the proceedings of the latter Society had created against its aid being obtained by any Clergy, except those of the "Evangelical party." But he was not allowed to name that Society. He therefore, immediately after the Meeting, addressed the following Note to the Manchester Courier:—

"To the EDITOR of the MANCHESTER COURIER.

"SIR,

"At the meeting on behalf of the *Additional Curates' Society*, held this day, the Chairman laid down the rule that no other Society should be *controversially named*. Consequently, in order to show the

comparatively superior claims of that Society on the confidence and support of the Church, I was *compelled* to have recourse to the *supposed* case of its having adopted *different* principles, and thus to show the evils which *might* have arisen from such principles.

" Though I do not question the prudence or the necessity of our respected Chairman's regulation, it seems to me hardly fair upon the *Pastoral Aid Society*, that *indirect* attacks be made upon it, which it could not answer with dignity. It is also repugnant to my habits and feelings, to shelter myself, (by not *naming* the Society,) from the responsibility which my observations might involve ; I, therefore, determined, please God, to take an early opportunity of *distinctly publishing a statement of the suspicious appearances* which attach to the *Pastoral Aid Society*, and respectfully calling upon them either to explain away the questionable appearances, or to remove the evil, if it exist. This is demanded, in justice not only to the well-being of the Church, but also to the character of the *Pastoral Aid Society* itself.

" I am,

" SIR,

" Your obedient Servant,

" I. E. N. MOLESWORTH.

" *Rochdale, Dec. 3, 1840.*"

Under the *appearances* against the *Pastoral Aid Society*, a danger of no ordinary magnitude threatens the Church ; and *unless the Additional Curates' Society be more extensively understood, and more largely supported*, by the community in general, that danger is increasing with fearful rapidity. This Society is unable to assist the Clergy appealing to it for aid, and they are driven to the *Pastoral Aid Society*, which may make its own terms, or refuse assistance.

The following passage from a Letter by a Clergyman, whose *nominations* have been *repeatedly rejected* Society, speaks volumes on this point :—

"I applied first to the Additional Curates' Society for help ; but their FUNDS WERE EXHAUSTED, and they could give me none, however much disposed to do so. Then, *in my need*, I had recourse to the Pastoral Aid Society, telling them I had applied to the Additional Curates' Society,—but unsuccessfully. They immediately responded by making a grant of £90. This occurred in the very early part of the present year ; and though I have *diligently* tried, I have *not yet* obtained a Curate."

As a comment to this, an extract from the Dean of Manchester's speech, and "THE POOR PARSON," may awaken a spirit of inquiry into the subject :—

"I believe that if the Society, consisting of laymen and clergymen of the Church of England, should presume to require any particular qualification as to the person who is to receive assistance from them—if it were allowed to them to require that he should have any particular bias in his opinions either religious or political, still more if they shall be allowed to call upon him to recognise the watchword of any political or religious party, *I think it would strike at the very existence of the Church of England. They would then set themselves up as a power superior to the Episcopacy*, and take into their hands the control of Church government ; and by limiting to a particular party of persons entertaining some particular bias or opinions, so large a portion of the situations to be occupied by the inferior Clergy, from whom ultimately the superior vacancies are to be filled up, they will gradually take possession of the whole establishment of the Church of England, *will gradually supersede the authority and discretion of the bishops, and assume complete control over the management of the Church.*"

"To the EDITOR of the STAFFORDSHIRE GAZETTE.

"SIR,—I have read with great interest your suggestion for the formation of a Diocesan Society, for the provision of additional Curates, and request your permission to offer a few remarks on the subject.

"There are, I understand, two societies already established in London for the same purpose. The one is 'The Society for the Employment of Additional Curates in populous places,' which (supplying the means) leaves the nomination of Curate to the Incumbent

of the Parish to be assisted, and interferes no further. The other, 'The Pastoral Aid Society,' affords its grants on the condition that the Curate shall just be approved by the Society's Committee. This latter plan is of some antiquity, and the precedent for it appears to be as follows :—

"In the year 1654, Cromwell caused an ordinance to be passed, appointing a committee of thirty-eight persons, whose business it was to examine all who were nominated to any ecclesiastical preferment. These gentlemen were called triers, and the manner in which they exerted what was then very properly called their 'Hyper-Archiepiscopal' and 'Super-Metropolitan' tyranny, (for their powers, like those of the Pastoral Aid Society, exceeded those of the Bishops,) was to reject all candidates whose theological opinions differed from their own *.

"I am not aware that even Cromwell's *triers* (as the Pastoral Aid Society does) undertook the responsibility of introducing Lay-Assistants to the Clergy.

"As, however, I have no wish to aid the revival of Puritanism, or to foster the notion that Committees are better judges of Curates and the needs of a Parish, than the Incumbent of the Parish and the Bishop of the Diocese, I beg to say, that if the society you propose be formed, I shall be happy to give a yearly subscription of 5*l.*; provided it does not copy in any respect the 'modus operandi' of the 'Hyper-Archiepiscopal' 'Super-Metropolitan' Pastoral Aid Society.

Yours, &c.

November 21, 1840.

A POOR PARSON.

* See Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 170.

P R E F A C E
TO
THE SECOND EDITION.

By some omissions and compressions, I am enabled to introduce a few cautions, by way of keeping the real question in view, which the defenders of the Pastoral Aid Society have endeavoured to hide, under personal abuse of me, and misrepresentation of my words.

1. The accusation is distinct and specific. I charge the Society with raising money under pretence of promoting only general Church purposes, when, in fact, it is used for *party* purposes; and with professing to respect "the order of the Church," and the Incumbent's right to appoint his own Curate, when, in practice, it retains a veto which can be worked to the subversion of the one and the invasion of the other. The question for the public is, Whether the evidence I adduce bears out the charge: Is it true, or false?

2. It is nothing to the purpose, whether I am partial, or ignorant, or angry. I am neither *judge* nor *witness*, but accuser. The judge is the public; the witnesses, the Society itself, and its own advocates. I challenge them to show a single instance of unfair quotation. The testimony is unquestionable. Does it or does it not prove the accusation?

If my *inferences* from that testimony be erroneous, let the error be shown. But personalities and abuse of me prove nothing in that respect.

3. It has been said, that the Pastoral Aid Society is not called upon to answer the charge, either officially or by an accredited champion, unless I could show myself accredited by the *Additional Curates Society* to make the charge. Strange logic! What has the latter Society to do with the matter, beyond having been mentioned by me with commendation, for the honesty and liberality of its rule, as compared with the exclusive and insidious veto of the Pastoral Aid Society? I repeat, I am the accuser. Is the Pastoral Aid Society to shrink from meeting a charge *affecting its honour*, and supported out of *its own documents*, because the sister Society is *not* the accuser?

4. An outcry is raised against me, as being the unprovoked aggressor. If I were, what would it be to the purpose? Aggressor or not, the simple question is, Guilty or not guilty of the charge? But the Society itself is the aggressor, by the retention, and use, of a veto for the *exclusion* of all but those of a certain *party*. When the Puritans urged Charles to exclude his tried friends, and surround himself with those whose canting hypocrisy professed excessive zeal for the Throne and Church, they branded with the name of malignants those, who saw through the deception and raised an alarm. They pretended, that these alarmists were *aggressors*. But the accusation was true, and the aggression was the *snare* that was laid for both Throne and Church. The veto, and use of the veto, by the Pastoral Aid Society is the aggres-

sion. It is a deception on those who would support the Church, and not party.

5. I have used the words "shabby," "insidious," &c. as applicable to the *machinery*, not the motives, of the Society.

6. I have treated as vague, and open to party purposes, not the requiring persons to be *really spiritually-minded*, but to be so "*to the satisfaction*" of the Committee, who may put upon it what sense *they please*. To give an opposite sense to my words, they have been wilfully garbled.

7. All defenders of the Pastoral Aid Society betray a consciousness of the truth of my charge, by endeavouring to *JUSTIFY* the Society in such a use of the veto as I complain of. If the Society be justified in such a use, it is not justified in *pretending* to act upon the principle of leaving the matter to the Incumbent, according to "*the order of the Church*." One says, the Puseyites ought to be excluded; another, that Clergy who may go to balls or races ought; and each has his own crotchet. But if one may be excluded by this veto, another may; and *all* may, who are not of "*THE PARTY*." No one doubts that improper Clergy should not be employed. But the person to see to this, in each case, is the *responsible* employer, the *Incumbent*, and not the Society. A "*tu quoque*" justification has been attempted, from the practice of the Society for Propagating the Gospel. If the cases were parallel, it might prove that Society wrong, but could not prove the other right. But the following statement will show that there is no analogy between the two cases:

"1. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is a *Church Society incorporated by charter* for the *express purposes* which it *fulfils*. The Pastoral Aid Society is *not*.

"2. The S. P. G. is a Society under *Church government*, the *whole* bench of bishops. The P. A. S. not only is not, but, in the rule in question, is *objected against* by the *majority* of the bishops.

"3. S. P. G. does not *invade* the Incumbent's province, but is usually itself in the *place* of the Incumbent; *appointing* the missionary to the *district*, not sending him into *another* man's district. It is, by 'the *order of the Church*,' *appointed* to perform (as to this matter) in the *Colonies*, that which, by the *same* order, is the *Incumbent's* province *here*. The P. A. S. *assumes* the responsibility, and *invades the right* which the 'order of the Church' vests in the *Incumbent*.

"4. The S. P. G. does not *pretend* to give an incumbent the nomination, &c., and yet retain a *veto*, which *in practice transfers* it to the Society. It *openly* claims the appointment. The P. A. S. does the reverse; *promises* the appointment to the Incumbent, but by its *veto* practically denies it to him.

"5. The S. P. G. is under the *necessity* of making the inquiry; for it *sends* the missionary from *this country* to a *distance*, where (even if it *were* a case of an Incumbent) the Incumbent *could not* make the inquiry himself. The P. A. S. is under *no* such *necessity*, but *needlessly* arrogates to itself the province of the Incumbent, who is both *bound* and *able* to make the inquiry himself."

8. *It had been* further argued, that the control of

the Society in the nomination of Curates is just as much according to "the order of the Church," as a *patron* presenting to a living. But surely a patron presenting to a living *by the authority* of the Church, and under *responsibility* to God and man by the *same authority*, is widely different from a *self-constituted* Society *without authority* of the Church, or without any lawful *responsibility*, *interfering* between the Incumbent and his Curate, and endeavouring to *control* him in that choice, for which he *has the authority of the Church*, and for which, upon every principle of law and reason, he is *responsible* to God and man. It requires no Solomon to distinguish these cases; but it must require a perverted mind, goaded by a consciousness of a weak cause, to confound them.

9. Though the Pastoral Aid Society is pleased to treat Incumbents as though they were not to be trusted with the choice of their own Curates—its own Committee may be open not only to party motives, but to mistake, quite as much as the Incumbent. The following case of which I know the names of the parties, (though I do not think fit to publish them,) may illustrate what may be done with the veto.

A. B. is *approved* by an *Incumbent* as suited to him, and to the flock for which he is responsible. His sound doctrine and sober life are testified (according to the order of the Church) by three unimpeachable Clergymen. But they are (so called) *Orthodox* Clergy. The Managers of the Pastoral Aid Society choose to consider A. B. as not *spiritually-minded* to *their "satisfaction,"* and reject him at once. A. B.,

guessing that he was rejected, because he was not recommended by one of their own clique, procures a fresh testimonial from (so called) evangelicals, but more particularly from C. D., who he believes to be a party man of some note with the Managers. The same A. B. who was not spiritually-minded enough for the Managers, is now *quite changed*, and *immediately* accepted. But when we come to inquire into C. D.'s pretensions, to be preferred to the *Incumbent*, and to the respectable Clergymen, whose testimonials were treated with contempt, what do we find? C. D. is *officially charged with adultery, and retires from his cure rather than face the investigation*. Thus the same A. B., who is not spiritually-minded to the *satisfaction* of the Committee, under the testimonials and approbation of three (so called) *Orthodox* Clergymen, and the *responsible pastor* of the parish, is immediately transmuted under the recommendation of a (so called) evangelical adulterer!

It may be sought to detract from the credibility of this case, on the ground that I do not publish the names. Let the reader make for this what deductions he pleases. I know the names, and believe the facts of the case to be those above stated. But I will take the lowest ground. I will only suppose that the veto *may* be so worked, by over-zealous and bigoted partisans. Is this a veto to which a single-minded Society, seeking only *peace* and *unity* in the Church, should so obstinately cling? Does not this tenacity betray a sectarian lust of power, likely to create *alarm* and dissension? If Jesuits themselves, assuming the *garb* of (so called) evangelicals, as they did formerly

that of dissenters, for the purpose of creating jealousies and divisions in the Church, were to devise a machinery, could they have framed one better adapted to the purpose than the insidious and proselyting veto in question? The very boast of the Society of the numbers over which their influence extends, and their organization for increasing it, shows the magnitude of the power which they would grasp themselves, though they would not tolerate it in *Bishop Marsh*.

The Managers of the Society also receive reports on the character of the Candidate, from persons with whom he is *never confronted*; whose *names* are *concealed*, and themselves *screened from responsibility*. Yet he is *rejected*, and branded, upon the testimony of these *secret* accusers; and their evidence is preferred to the *open* and *responsible* testimonials of the three Clergymen, who give *their names*, and *stake their character*, on what they state. The proceedings of the Managers already adduced, give ground for suspicion that these *secret* referees, as well as the Managers, are generally *party* men. I call on the Committee to test this, by publishing the *names* and *addresses* of the *Members* of that Committee, and of *all* the individuals to whom they have *referred cases* for inquiry *for the last two years*.

10. One of the defenders of the Society expresses his willingness that some form of testimonial should be adopted by the Society *free from party terms*. Let the Society itself make such a proposition. I readily hold out the olive branch. I suggest as a plan for preventing other than fit clergymen from

being employed—that the Society should require from the *Incumbent*, a testimonial or declaration, that *he* had made due and diligent inquiry into the character of the Candidate, and that *he* (not the Society) was satisfied that the said Candidate was of sound doctrine, and sober life, pious, spiritually-minded, and fit and willing to labour in the Ministry to which he was to be appointed. *This* would be a protection against improper Curates, without invading the right of the *responsible* employer of those Curates. It is the Incumbent, not the Society, who, according to the order of the Church which the Society *professes* to respect, is *responsible* for the choice of his Curate, and whom the Society *insults* by refusing to trust him with that choice, and deceives with the promise of that power, which, by its veto, it endeavours to wrest from him.

I have said my words have been *wilfully garbled* to misrepresent my meaning. The person I charge with this, and with slandering me and the Clergy generally, is the Rev. Caleb Whitefoord. I shall publish a letter to him to substantiate these heavy charges, and to show the friends of the Pastoral Aid Society by what arts it is defended; and into what blind and bigoted agents the working of the dangerous veto may fall.

A LETTER

TO THE

LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER.

MY LORD,

I ADDRESS this letter to you, not with a view of drawing your Lordship into a controversy in defence of the *Pastoral Aid Society*, nor intending to imply that you are responsible for its acts; but I trust that this course will have the effect of bringing the matter gravely before the Society itself. My addressing your Lordship will also be a pledge, that though I mean to approach the question frankly and unsparingly, yet not without being under the influence of that respect, which your station demands from a clergyman of your diocese, and which your talents and virtues render a cheerful tribute.

I am sure your Lordship will feel with me, that, after the publication of the correspondence between the Society and the Rev. Messrs. Clark and Browne, the questions therein raised cannot be set at rest, without either an abandonment of the objectionable test, or at least a clear and explicit understanding upon the character and designs of the Society. The Society owes to itself, as well as to the Church, an

official vindication from the questionable (to say the least) *appearances* against it, which that correspondence discloses.

There are several minor points of objection to the Pastoral Aid Society; such as the divided opinion of the Bishops upon it—the system of lay assistants, and the assumption of laymen to recommend annual sermons in parishes not for *parochial* purposes, but for *general* purposes, without the direction of the Queen or the Archbishops. But these I shall at present throw out of the question, and confine myself to the main issue. That issue is, whether the Pastoral Aid Society is not an engine, adapted and used, not for *general Church* purposes, but to *disseminate the doctrines, and to multiply the missionaries, of a SECT or PARTY* in the Church.

If it be so, let it assume its *proper colours*. Let it at once disclose the contracted basis of its scheme, and say, that it is an engine of what is termed the *Evangelical party*.—Let it not claim the *general* support of *churchmen*, upon the pretence of being a *Church Society*;—let it not profess to be built on the broad basis which the Church has laid down, when in practice it promotes the views of a party.

If it be *not* so, then let it *explain away* the *appearances* which render it an object of suspicion; or revise the *rules*, which put it *into the power* of a few *active zealots*, to make it the instrument of sectarian and party purposes. The Society has done much good, and may do much more with the large funds at its disposal; but it must not expect the continuance of Church support, unless it acts upon *Church, not party* principles; for the designs of such a *Society must be an object of jealousy to the Church*.

The powers of it are gigantic, and, if employed in extending schisms, and sectarian influence in the Church, may produce incalculable mischief. The Curates employed are dependent for income, *not* on the *incumbents*, but on the *Society*. They look to the *Society* for *new* situations, if one be lost,—they may easily, under the *vague* test of being “*spiritual-minded*,” be excluded from *all* its appointments. If promoted by the *influence* of the *Society*, they will probably be of the *party views* of the *Society’s managers*, and perhaps opposed to those of the *incumbent*. The *Society* claims to have annual sermons preached for it wherever its missionaries are sent; thus pre-occupying the ground against any appeal from the Church *Society for promoting the employment of additional Curates*. It roots itself all over the country; it gets possession of the greater part of the funds, and the clergy must either leave their flocks unaided, or take the party missionaries of a party *Society*. Thus, clergymen who disapprove of the principles of the *Society* may be almost compelled to lend their pulpits to collect funds for it, and enlarge its dangerous powers. Now, my Lord, the dangerous power of such a machinery, if wielded for *party* purposes to extend a *schism* in the Church, must be obvious. It must excite jealousy and suspicion. It must be the bounden duty of those, who *differ* from those party views, to watch it, as they value the welfare of the Church; and no less must it be the duty of the *Society* itself, if it *has no* such party views, to remove carefully *all appearances* of them; to have no door open for trick and evasion, no innovations, no vague *rules*, by which crafty parizans or bigoted zealots may work their purposes.

I wish to do the former, and to give the Society an occasion, without compromise of their own dignity, to do the latter. I therefore address your Lordship as a patron, an influential, and, I may add, a *counselling*, member of that Society. I append my name, as an incumbent of your diocese, to this public declaration of the objections against the Society, to this call for their removal.

No man regrets more than myself that divisions should exist in the Church; but as long as they do exist, they must influence. The *exclusive* appropriation of the terms *evangelical*, *pious*, *spiritual-minded*, may be seen in abundance in the organs of party. And the movements of Societies are frequently *directed* by a few zealous (and sometimes indiscreet, though sincere) men, who sacrifice every thing to their own party prepossessions, and exclusive views. Witness for example that direct party fund, set apart by Mr. Simeon for purchasing livings, to which *only those*, whom he chose to consider as exclusively *spiritual-minded*, were to be presented. If Societies cannot prevent party men from taking a lead in their management, they can at least avoid the adoption of tests *evidently adapted* to enable these party men to make the Society subservient to their narrow views.

For the more distinct development of the objections to the Pastoral Aid Society, and of the remedy for them, I will

I. First advert to the constitution of the "ADDITIONAL CURATES' SOCIETY," and point out what I conceive to be its superiority over the "Pastoral Aid Society."

II. I will take a cursory view of the correspond-

ence of the "Pastoral Aid Society," with the Rev. J. Clark and Mr. Browne; and also of some other cases, developing the objectionable operation of the *vague* test of being *spiritual-minded*.

1. "THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CURATES" follows the order of our Church in its government. The control of it is vested in the *archbishops*, *bishops*, the treasurer, and twelve clergymen, *assisted* by twelve laymen, named by the archbishops. Its main purpose is not open to objection from any Churchman; being merely to promote the employment of ministers called and ordained by those, to whom the Church acknowledges the power and office of ordaining to belong. It has no rule or policy open to *objection* from any *Churchman*, be his party-views what they may. A Churchman may object to the employment of lay assistants, and urge, that he does not think it in accordance with the spirit of our ministerial commission; and that there is reason to fear, that though the Pastoral Aid Society may not *intend*, it has not the power to prevent those lay assistants from becoming lay *preachers*. I do not question whether he may be right or wrong in this view; but I assume only, that it may be matter of opinion, and a ground of objection, not *inconsistent* with Church principles. But no man, on such principles, can object to the employment of *episcopally ordained curates*. He may affirm, that the Additional Curates' Society does not do enough, but he cannot *object* to what it *actually does*.

The same reasoning applies to the circumstance of the Additional Curates' Society being under the

control and patronage of the whole bench of Bishops. Some churchmen may consistently object to the *divided* opinion and *partial* patronage of the Bishops, in the Pastoral Aid Society; but no churchman can consistently object to the *entire* bench of Bishops controlling and patronizing, with *unanimous approval*, the Additional Curates' Society.

But these objectionable features in the Pastoral Aid Society, and these points of superiority in the *Society for promoting the employment of additional Curates*, are, as I have said, of minor importance, compared with the main question at issue. That question I shall now approach, in adverting to Rules IV. and V. of the Additional Curates' Society.

IV. That the Committee be empowered to make annual grants of money, towards the maintenance of additional Clergymen in those Parishes and Districts which are most in need of such assistance; strict regard being in all cases had to the spiritual wants of the Parish or District, the *rights of the Incumbent*, and the authority of the Bishop of the Diocese.

V. That no such grant be made, except upon application from the Incumbent of the Parish or District, for aid towards the payment of a Curate, to be *nominated by him to the Bishop for his approval and licence*.

The same principle is adopted, though more concisely expressed, in the rules of the Society for promoting the employment of additional Curates in Ireland.

"*The Curate, for whose maintenance a grant is made by the Society, is to be thereupon nominated by the INCUMBENT TO THE BISHOP for his approval and licence, as in ORDINARY cases of STIPENDIARY CURATES.*" Here is a plain purpose to *aid* the incumbent in what he requires—not to *supersede* him

—to give him, truly and honestly, the *choice, engagement, superintendence, and control* of the Curate. Here are no means of *secret inquiry*, whether the Curate be of *high or low* Church views—no interference with the *rights* of incumbents to select a man, in their judgment, best adapted to the necessities of their own parishes, and most likely to work in harmony with them, in promoting the salvation of “the congregations *committed to their charge* *.” It is enough for the Society to find that an incumbent (the *proper judge*, in such case, of the sort of Curate he wants for the congregation committed by the Church “to his charge,”) requires a Curate. They ask him only to show his *necessities*, and the necessities of the *population*. They do not want to inquire, whether the Curate, *he* thinks best suited for him, and for “the congregation committed to him,” be *evangelical or orthodox*. Their offer is to this effect:—Choose your own Curate; look out a fit man for your charge; satisfy the *Bishop* according to the practice of the Church, that he is such a person as he would *licence to a stipendiary curacy*; and we will *pay the stipend*. This is the clear straightforward course, which common sense and common honesty point out for a Society, really intending to offer its *aid*, (not its *dictation*) upon the broad and comprehensive basis of Church principles, and to leave *no opening* for its becoming the instrument of mere sectarian and party views. Will the rule of the Pastoral Aid Society, stand this sifting of honesty and common sense? I must contend, that it will not. I will not affirm that the rule was *designed*

* Liturgy : prayer for the Clergy and People.

to be the instrument of a shabby and crooked policy; but I will affirm, that if it *had* been so designed, it could not have been better *contrived*; and that, in practice, it has very much the *appearance* of having been so *worked*. And this affirmation I now propose to bear out, by an appeal to facts.

The Society may state its own plan in its own words:—

PLAN.—The Church Pastoral Aid Society strictly regards the wants of the Church on the one hand, and the order of the Church on the other. It would make the Church efficient; it would carry the Gospel, by means of the Church, to every man's door, but it never obtrudes its aid: the Incumbent must apply for aid, or sanction the application; and until this is done, the Society cannot move. When aid is sought and granted, the Parochial Minister must say how it is to be employed; he must nominate the persons to be employed—he must engage them, as well as superintend and entirely control them; all that the Society does is to provide for their remuneration; and while so doing, to ask satisfactory *proof* of their qualifications.

Now, this would lead to the supposition, that the Society intended to leave the *whole choice* of the Curate to the incumbent, and according to the *order of the Church*. No one would suppose from this, that the Society meant, in the choice of this Curate, to *supersede the judgment* of the incumbent to whose *charge* the Church has committed his congregation; and consequently, to whose judgment she has left the *suitableness* of the persons and means to be adopted for the spiritual welfare of that congregation. No one would suppose that the Committee of the Pastoral Aid Society meant to assume a judgment, which should belong to them only, if the congregation had been committed to *their charge*, instead of that of the incumbent. It would be *presumed*, that this power of demanding proof could be

intended only to prevent flagrant abuse of the Society's funds. But, under the plea of requiring "satisfactory *proof*" of the Curate's qualifications, a *veto* is retained, which renders the promised *nomination, engagement, &c.* of a Curate by the incumbent a mere bubble ; and enables the Society, by *secret* inquiries, or *repeated exercises* of its *veto*, to compel the incumbent either to adopt what its *managers* are *pleased to understand* by *faithful, devoted, pious, spiritual-minded*, and such like indefinite terms ; or else to abandon, in despair, their assistance*.

If, my Lord, you will be pleased to consult the records of the Society's proceedings, I doubt not you will find many such cases. But I am not resting my arguments at present upon the *actual existence* of such cases, though I know they do exist. It is enough for me that the plan is *open*, undeniably open, to this gross and sectarian abuse. It is a bad plan. It is a plan contrary to the comprehensive, healing, uniting spirit of our Articles. It is a plan which ought to be exchanged for the honest, straight-forward, comprehensive Catholic rule of the Additional Curates' Society. It is an insidious plan ;—it is a plan fit for a society with shabby, *party*, and *sectarian* designs, but not for a society *with simply and singly Church views*. It places the Society above *the Bishops* and

* I have before me a letter of a clergyman, who has sent up two at least, if not more Curates, who were rejected (though such as he would have nominated and engaged most gladly) upon the vague jargon of the Society. He has been the better part of a year trying to find a Curate to "satisfy" them ; but, as he is not himself what is called "Evangelical," nor disposed to nominate an "Evangelical" Curate, he has laboured in vain. I have not invited communications of such cases, but doubt not that I should have plenty were I desirous.

Archbishops ;—it casts contempt on the incumbent as *unfit to be trusted with the choice of his own Curate*;—it subjects the Curate to have his character tarnished by *secret* accusers, whose *name*, whose *charges*, whose *proofs* are *withheld from him*, and it conveys an insinuation upon the presbyters of the Church, *who*, under an *awful responsibility*, and according to the *order* of that Church, are required to testify to the Bishop, their belief that the candidate is fit to be licenced as a Curate. Upon what Church principle are the testimonials of these men to be set aside, for the vague *affirmation* that the candidate is not “spiritual-minded?” It is no answer to say, that the Society may annex *its own conditions* to its own *grants*. That *power* is not questioned. The question is whether the *condition* is not liable to be abused to *sectarian* views; and whether a society *insisting on such a condition* is justified in *asking support from the people as a “CHURCH SOCIETY.”* To me it appears that it is not. It is “sailing under false colours.”

The Pastoral Aid Society has availed itself of your Lordship’s authority and arguments to uphold their (in my opinion erroneous) position, that to the *managers* of that Society, and *not* to the *incumbent*, ought to be left the judgment of the Curate’s *fitness* for the work for which the *incumbent* requires him. Those arguments of your Lordship have now become public property, and I should not be doing the Society justice if I were here to deny them the advantage of an advocate so able, and so justly revered. Your Lordship has said :—

“ Others may urge, and with more plausible reason, that it should be left to the incumbent. I am of a different mind. The incumbent may be so anxious for assistance as to think any help better than

none ; or he may be so biassed by friendship as to be unable to form a just opinion. But the Society, though desiring to relieve the incumbents, has always professed that its main object was to benefit the population and enlarge the usefulness of the Church, and therefore it exercises what I think not only a wholesome discretion, but a right which you would not be justified in surrendering."

Most respectfully I offer my reasons for dissenting from the conclusion to which you have arrived.

Your Lordship has argued upon *exceptions*, not on the *general* character of the incumbents. You cannot mean that the incumbents *in general* will *sacrifice the welfare* of their flocks, and choose an unfit man to minister to them. You cannot argue that the *incumbents as a body* are so lost to a sense of the responsibility of their sacred office, so weak, so childish in their judgment, that they *cannot be trusted* with the choice of their own curates, unless placed in the leading-strings of the Pastoral Aid Society. If that be the case, neither incumbents should presume to choose, nor bishops to licence, stipendiary Curates at all. The Church should create *a new tribunal* :— No man should be allowed to take a curate, till a committee of Pastoral Aid *managers* should have exercised its spiritual vision, have looked *into his heart*, and pronounced him *spiritual-minded*. The very application to the Society shows an interest in the spiritual state of his parishioners. Nay indeed, you do not speak of the supposed improper bias of the incumbents as a *general* rule, but as a *contingency* which *may* occur. You mention what, under *certain circumstances*, he *may* do, but your Lordship will not deny, that, *generally*, an incumbent *will not* do so. You will not think so ill of your clergy as to charge them generally with a readiness to disregard the spi-

ritual welfare of their parishioners. Now, my Lord, look also at the *other* side of the picture. If we grant that the incumbent *may* (not occasionally, as you claim, but even *frequently*) abuse the assistance, consider, if we are to argue from what *may* happen, what the *managers* of the Pastoral Aid Society *may* do, on the other hand. They *may* abuse the rule to the sectarian purposes already mentioned; they *may* (under the terms, "*satisfactory proof*" and "*spiritual-minded*") exclude from the aid of the Society every clergyman who will not adopt their *Shibboleth*, and *may* force the *missionaries of a party* into populous places, where, to use your Lordship's language, "the incumbent may be so anxious for assistance as to think any help better than none."

This necessity (arising, I am sorry to say, in some degree from the *insufficient* funds of the Church "Society for promoting the employment of additional Curates") has *driven* some clergymen to apply to the Pastoral Aid Society, although they could not in their conscience entirely approve of some of its principles. With some, but rather severe justice, it is sneeringly asked of the Rev. Mr. Clark and Mr. Browne, "with what consistency *they* applied for aid" from such a Society? It is such a taunt as an overseer might fling in the face of a starving man, who *reluctantly* came for parish relief, because he could get none elsewhere. But there *is* justice in it, though severe, and I must urge the inconsistency still further. How can clergymen, who disapprove of *part* of the rules of the Pastoral Aid Society, consistently *allow their pulpits* to be used at its bidding, to *advocate its cause and extend its dangerous power*? I can suggest only one plea—that the clergy were

not *generally* aware of the *proselyting* powers of the society. They were deceived by the professions of *Church order* and *freedom of choice* held out. They fancied the objections were confined only to the lay assistants and other *minor* matters. But even then, there is inconsistency. For the Society cannot be advocated in *part*, it must be recommended as a *whole*. And surely it becomes every incumbent to beware what he allows to be recommended from *his pulpit*, and under *his authority*. If he should thus sow sectarian seeds and divisions in his own parish, bitter will be the harvest he will reap, and dearly will the Church pay for his utilitarian concessions of principle to expediency.

But, my Lord, even this is only a half-view of the subject. There is another question, and a very grave question, for our consideration. To *whose* charge are "congregations committed?" To whom has the *order of the Church*, to which the Society *professes to adhere*, committed the charge of judging who or what is fit and proper for each parish? Has it committed it to the *incumbent*, or to the *Pastoral Aid Society*? In the prayer before quoted, I find "*Bishops** and *Curates*, and congregations committed to *their* charge." But I cannot find any "*order of the Church*," for committing them to the *Pastoral Aid Society*! It does seem to me that, in this pretension of the Society, it disregards or overlooks both the *order of the Church*, and also the "*rights* of

* We remember the outcry raised by the "Evangelicals" at Bishop Marsh's "Questions" to detect Calvinism. Yet that inquisitorial power which a *Bishop* could not be trusted to exercise under *known* tests, is claimed for a society of *Laymen* and Clergy upon *indefinite* tests, and seemingly upon *secret* information—the Society having no church authority, and being a self-constituted tribunal.

incumbents," so judiciously and honorably respected by the *Society for the employment of additional Curates*. But even descending from the high ground of Church duty to the mere utilitarian view, it is but reasonable that the incumbent should institute any *particular* inquiries, as to his Curate's *spirit* and *efficiency*, beyond the testimonials required by the Bishop. For not only the *general* faithfulness and diligence of a Curate, and his suitableness to *that particular parish*, are subjects of an *incumbent's* inquiry; but also his *agreement* in doctrinal and practical views with the *incumbent* himself. On this last point, he *alone* can be the proper judge. But this is inferior ground. The main ground is, that the order of the Church, and the very nature and commission of the Priesthood, vests in the incumbent the *responsibility*, and with it the *right* of choosing fit men and means to promote the salvation of those "committed to his charge." The Pastoral Aid Society cannot assume that right, or an interference with that right, without contravening the "order of the Church;" and placing itself in a position in which it *may* be the engine of sectarian purposes, and yet claim support upon the pretence of being a Church Society.

I have said it *may* be the instrument of this dangerous and doubled-faced policy. I must go a step further, and urge, that, according to *present appearances*, (which I hope it may be able to explain away), it actually *has been* so. This affirmation I support—

II. Upon the *correspondence of the Pastoral Aid Society*, with *the Rev. J. Clark and Mr. Browne*, and *some other cases*, which I propose as the second *subject of consideration*.

The entire correspondence will be found in the Appendix*; and I shall merely notice briefly those points which seem to have raised a very general, and apparently not groundless suspicion, that the principle adopted by the Pastoral Aid Society, not only may be, but actually has been used for the furtherance of *divisions and party views*.

The facts of the case are simply these:—

The Rev. Mr. Clark nominates Mr. Briarly Browne, and testifies that he is highly respectable. He forwards the testimonials of *four beneficed clergymen*, with your Lordship's declaration that they are such, and *worthy of credit*. Their testimonials are very honourable to Mr. Browne; they speak of him as one whose *life and conversation* have been such as *would become a minister of the Gospel*; as a *strictly conscientious* man; one who had made it his study to become thoroughly acquainted with the doctrines and discipline of the Church, with the spirit of which he appears deeply imbued.

Now after these high and explicit testimonials, and after the incumbent's choice of Mr. Browne, as fitted for *that* congregation, the Society take upon themselves to notify that these testimonials are satisfactory *as far as they go, but are not sufficiently decided and explicit as to his* CHRISTIAN CHARACTER AND QUALIFICATIONS. Therefore a *conscientious* man, a man whose *life and conversation* have been such as *becomes a minister of the Gospel*, who has *studied* the doctrines and discipline of the Church, and is *imbued with the spirit* of them, is not a CHRISTIAN CHARACTER. Upon being called upon for something

* Appendix A.

more definite than this vague ground of rejection, the Society give the following explanation:—"We wish to be *satisfied* that Mr. Browne is a *spiritually-minded and devoted man; one who will preach faithfully and fully the great truths of the Gospel, and give himself up to the duties of the ministry.* And until we are satisfied that he is such a one, we cannot sanction the nomination." Now, my Lord, painful as it is to allude to these divisions in the Church, are not all these phrases to be found every day in the Record newspaper, and other organs of the "Evangelical party" in the Church, as *exclusively* designating only those who belong to *that party*. Do they not there denote, not Churchmen *generally*, but only *that party* in the Church? Is not the plain meaning of the Society in this matter—We must have a curate of *our peculiar views*, or we will not aid you at all? As both Mr. Clark and Mr. Browne well observe, how can the Society judge of his being "spiritual-minded," but by his own declaration? As far as outward testimony can go, he has it in the evidence of the Clergy who signed his testimonials.

Is not the denial of *Christian character and qualification, of spiritual-mindedness, &c.* to Mr. Browne upon such testimonials, until "*we*" (the Pastoral Aid managers) are satisfied, pretty strong evidence that "*we*" have *exclusively* appropriated those qualifications, not to those who have *studied the doctrines and discipline* of the Church, and conformed their lives and sentiments to them, but only to those who take the same *peculiar and party* views of that doctrine as "*we*" (the said managers) do? But I will not bind the Society down by the evidence of one rejection, or of one set of terms. I will cite another in which a

Curate, not the *first* nominated by the incumbent, is after a great loss of time and trouble discarded by these despotic and irresponsible managers.

“We feel some difficulty in adopting the nomination, not from *any doubt* of Mr. ——’s moral character, or of his *activity* in his *ministerial duty*, but because we do not see that *evidence* which *we* desire to receive of the *orthodoxy* of his preaching: that *we* are deeply convinced that activity in the ministry can only be useful, so far as it is connected with the promulgation of those doctrines which are taught in Holy Scriptures, and exhibited by the Church as the *prominent* sensus of divine revelation. We do not mean to impute to Mr. —— deficiency in this respect, but *we* wish to be *satisfied* that his *instructions* are such as, under God’s blessing, will promote the *great end* for which our Society has been established, the salvation of souls through the instrumentality of ‘faithful and devoted men.’”

I cannot tell in what light all this “hide-and-seek” phraseology appears to others, but to me it seems very like the language of one, not exactly wishing to speak out plainly his own meaning. I think I could, in a dozen words, express it more clearly, and in a way in which a plain man, and with a plain purpose in view, would like to express it. Thus: “We are a Society for (so called) *Evangelical* Curates, and we will accept *no other*.” This would be speaking out, and saving time and trouble. My Lord, I *know* the Curate alluded to in the above passage. I affirm, that he is an *orthodox* and *active* minister, as *faithful* as any to whom the Pastoral Aid Society may choose to appropriate that epithet. He does preach the doctrines of the Scriptures according to the articles

of the English branch of Christ's Church. Will the Pastoral Aid Society state, in plain English, *what* are its TESTS, and *what proofs* it requires of *orthodoxy*? If to have lived a life *becoming a minister of the Gospel*—if to have *studied*, and have been *imbued with the spirit* of the doctrines and discipline of the Church—if to be approved by four presbyters of the Church as fit for the ministry—if all these are *not proofs of orthodoxy*, let the managers state distinctly what proofs they do mean. It will not be allowed that a mysterious shibboleth is to be set up against these proofs, and the Pastoral Aid Society to claim support as a Church Society, having a "single eye to the glory of God," and no proselyting views of spreading the missionaries, and the power of a party.

The closing letter of the correspondence crowns all. I cannot think so lightly of your Lordship's penetration, as not to judge, that you, as well as myself, would regret, that any Society, professing to be a *religious*, and especially a *Church Society*, should have suffered such a letter to go forth. The poor shuffling attempt to justify their *previous* proceedings, from expressions *elicited* by those proceedings, is very *little* indeed. And I must add, that those proceedings, as far as they *appear* in the *correspondence*, quite justify the language used. The Society's proceedings *appear* to be those of a sectarian, not of a Church Society; and for such a Society to *profess* to be a *Church Society*, appears to be "*raising money on false pretences.*"

A respectable Clergyman, (whose real name is known to me,) under the signature "H.," describes *his own case* in the British Magazine for September last, after having had successive nominations rejected,

without any *substantial reason assigned*, and, as he justly inferred, simply because he would not nominate a Curate of a "*certain party*," as he observes,—

"It would surely be a more honest, if not a more prudent course, if the Society avowedly claimed the nomination and appointment to themselves. This, however, is at present really exercised, whilst the opprobrium of such a flagrant violation of Church order is evaded."

And Mr. Browne is fairly, without *any offence* to the Society, entitled to draw the distinction between making "his confession" to the *Minister*, and to a "*Lay Society*." The Church is indebted to those gentlemen for having boldly brought the subject before the public. They have, at least, made out a case, which the Society are bound to clear up; and which, if they cannot answer satisfactorily, they will be unworthy of Church confidence, and deserve to be assailed in all quarters by those who would avoid divisions, and protect the Church from insidious enemies. This is strong language, but the danger requires it.

One more point, my Lord, I would state, which is, that this suspicion of the Pastoral Aid Society being a Society merely for the spreading the missionaries and doctrines of the so-called "*Evangelical*" party, is not confined to those who differ from that party, but a *friend* and *defender* of that Society hails it as such; most cordially abuses the Clergy who are out of that party, and boldly rejoices in the Society as *superseding* the Archbishops and Bishops, and exercising their functions. This may be seen in some extracts from the Liverpool

Standard, which I print in the Appendix*. I do not make your Lordship, or the Society, responsible for the line of defence which indiscreet friends may take; but I request your attention to those extracts, as *evidence* that the *advocates*, as well as the opponents, of the Pastoral Aid Society, recognize it, *not* as a *general* Church Society, but an instrument of a party in the Church; in one word, as an instrument of those who style themselves, or have been styled, "*Evangelical*."

Now, my Lord, in conclusion, let me disclaim any thought or intention, in the least degree disrespectful, or unkind, towards yourself, or even to the Pastoral Aid Society, apart from the point at issue. The importance of the subject requires, *that no* courtesies should suppress *plain speaking* upon it. But I am deeply impressed with respect for your Lordship's station, your known acquirements and abilities, your kindness and singleness of heart, and, above all, your earnest and honest zeal and piety. If any thing could make me doubt the accuracy of my conclusions, it would be, that I have the misfortune to differ from your Lordship. With respect to the Pastoral Aid Society, I would gladly see its career of good *unobstructed*, and see its workings, as a *sister* to the Additional Curates' Society, for the Church.

But that cannot be, while it retains that *fatal* rule, and still less, while it acts upon the tortuous and questionable application of the rule which the correspondence mentioned exhibits.

* Appendix B.

The *great body* of its *Subscribers* have, I am confident, no such designs as appear in the correspondence to which I have alluded. Many contribute to it under the belief, that it is a Church Society, desiring only to *aid*, and not to *domineer* over, the Clergy, to extend the influence of the Church, and not of a *party* in the Church. Let it become really such a Society. I beseech your Lordship to use that influence, which you so justly possess, to make it such. It is in a false position; there is but one course to safety and honour, the abandonment of that position.

Both Societies, instead of being bitter rivals, might then have but one honest design and labour of love, one holy emulation, to *benefit* and *unite* the Church, the body of Christ, with its spiritual Head and with all his members. We should not then quarrel about your lay assistants; we, who may not approve, should not use them; and, though others might, we should not be alarmed. But it is with your *machinery* for *proselyting*, that we wage war. Whether it be used, or not, there it is—ready for use, and an object of *perpetual jealousy and suspicion*. I pray you, my Lord, urge them for their own honour, for the glory of God, for the peace, union, and strength, of our dear, honoured, and holy Church, to abandon their fatal rules of sitting in judgment on the suitableness of the Curates, and requiring the Clergy, who are aided, to preach for the Society.

Say to them—take up the straight-forward, catholic, liberal, and honest rule of the sister Society, for “PROMOTING THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CURATES.” Let *no door* be open

to bigots or zealots of party, to make the Society a tool for their sectarian spirit to work with. Leave the incumbents the *undoubted right* of choosing their own Curates, subject to no control but that of their *ecclesiastical* superior, the Bishop, with no *conditions* which interfere with their conscientious views of duty. Do not attempt to force, or to wriggle in, your interpretation of the Articles upon others. Leave the same liberty, that the Church has left them in this respect. Do not *tie them down* to preach for you, when perhaps they cannot approve of one part of your proceeding, though they may of another. Let them preach or not preach for you, as they please. Do not inquire whether the Curate chosen by the *incumbent* be a "*high*" or "*low*" Churchman; but only whether the incumbent's necessities, and those of his *population*, are such that your *aid* is requisite to *pay* an additional Curate.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient
humble Servant,

I. E. N. MOLESWORTH.

A P P E N D I X.

(A.)

To the Editor of the Leeds Intelligencer.

Sir,—You will oblige me by publishing the following correspondence between the Secretary of the Pastoral Aid Society and myself. I shall only premise a remark in justification of an observation of mine in one of my letters to Mr. Were, which might otherwise appear to be too severe. In the “Synopsis of the Society” I found it stated as a rule that, “when aid is sought and granted, the parochial minister must say how it is to be employed; he *must nominate the persons to be employed*, HE MUST ENGAGE THEM, as well as superintend and entirely control them; *all that the Society does is to provide for their remuneration; and while so doing, to ask satisfactory proof of their qualifications.*” Nothing can be fairer than this. I accordingly applied in the name of the incumbent of Hunslet, Mr. Forster, for assistance to the Society, and a salary of 80*l.* a-year was voted to a clergyman to be nominated by me, Mr. Forster’s representative. I consequently nominated Mr. Briarly Browne, a gentleman of the highest respectability, and my nomination led to the correspondence which I now submit to the public, for the purpose of saving other Clergymen from being involved in needless trouble similar to that which I have received, and which has been incurred by others of my brethren who profess orthodox principles, and in the hope that some persons who have hitherto subscribed to the Pastoral Aid Society may withdraw from that institution, and give their support to the orthodox society, “The Society for the Employment of Additional Curates in Populous

Places." It will be seen that the Pastoral Aid Society assumes archi-episcopal authority over the Bishops themselves.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

JOHN CLARK, Curate of Hunslet.

On nominating Mr. Browne, I forwarded his testimonials to the Secretary of the Society. These testimonials, it will be seen, were countersigned by the Lord Bishop of Chester.

I hereby certify that I have known Mr. Thomas Briarly Browne for a considerable time, and have much pleasure in stating that I believe his life and conversation are such as becomes a Minister of the Gospel, and that his views and doctrines are in accordance with the Articles and Homilies of the Church.

J. H. STAFFORD, Minister of St. Paul's, Liverpool.

33, Islington, Liverpool, 2d October, 1840.

I have great pleasure in stating that I have known Mr. Thomas Briarly Browne about five years, and believe him to be a *strictly* conscientious man, and a devoted admirer and supporter of the ritual and discipline of the Church. I have no doubt but that he will exert himself diligently in any sphere of usefulness to which he may be appointed.

EDMUND B. CHALMER, B.A.,
Incumbent of Great Crosby, near Liverpool.

Mr. Chalmer, as well as Messrs. Wray and Stafford, are benefited Clergy in the Diocese of Chester, and worthy of credit.

J. B. CHESTER.

Liverpool, Oct. 3, 1840.

My Lord,—I take the liberty of troubling your Lordship with a brief testimonial in favour of Mr. Browne, who is a candidate for holy orders at your Lordship's hands. I have every reason to believe that Mr. Browne will prove himself qualified for the holy office he seeks, having made it his study to become thoroughly acquainted with the doctrines and discipline of the Church, with the spirit of which he appears deeply imbued.

I think that he is fully alive to the responsibilities of the ministry, and anxious to devote himself to the laborious duties of the Curacy to which your Lordship may appoint him.

I am, with great respect,
Your Lordship's faithful and obedient Servant,
CECIL WRAY,

Minister of St. Martin's Church, Liverpool.

To the Lord Bishop of Ripon.

Temple Chambers, Oct. 15, 1840.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Mr. Browne's testimonials are satisfactory as far as they go, but they are not sufficiently decided and explicit as to his Christian character and qualifications.

We should be glad if you would furnish us with further evidence on which to come to a decision.

Your's, &c.

E. B. WERE, Ch. Sec. P. A. S.

Hunslet, Oct. 16, 1840.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Before I write to Mr. Browne on the subject of your letter, it is necessary for me to understand what you mean by "Christian character and qualifications." You will oblige me by answering this letter as soon as you conveniently can, as I have already hired a room for service in the Pottery Fields, and the Bishop has accepted Mr. Browne's testimonials, and promised to admit him as a candidate for holy orders.

Your's, &c. JOHN CLARK.

Temple Chambers, Oct. 16, 1840.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—You will allow me to say that you have acted prematurely in presenting Mr. Browne's testimonials to the Bishop; that is, with the view of his being ordained on one of the Society's grants, as also in engaging a school-room. The regulations require that, in the first instance, the Society shall be satisfied as to the character and qualifications of the gentleman nominated by the applicant for aid.

I really can scarcely think that any one who knows the great objects for which this Society was established, can be at a loss to understand what is meant by "Christian character and qualification." To explain, however, we wish to be satisfied that Mr. Browne is a spiritually-minded and devoted man; one who will preach faithfully and fully the great truths of the gospel, and give himself up to the duties of the ministry. And until we are satisfied that he is such an one, we cannot sanction the nomination.

Yours, &c.

E. B. WERE, Sec. P. A. S.

Hunslet, Oct. 18, 1840.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—It appears to me from your letter, that you are not aware that, as a consistent churchman, I could not take such a step as to recommend a Curate to receive a salary from your Society without first consulting the Bishop. And if the testimonials are satisfactory to the Bishop, I presume that they must be so to the Society, as the Society can have no intention to insult his Lordship.

Unless the Bishop be fully satisfied that Mr. Browne will preach faithfully the great truths of the gospel, you may be quite sure that his Lordship will not ordain him. How the Society can be satisfied that Mr. Browne is a spiritually-minded and devoted man, except from his assuring them of the facts, I know not. But that assurance he will doubtless give.

Yours, &c. JOHN CLARK.

Hunslet, Oct. 26, 1840.

Rev. Sir,—I beg you to peruse the accompanying letter which I have received from Mr. Browne, and which I hope and trust will entirely remove any existing doubts on your part as to his “Christian character and qualifications.” I shall feel obliged by a reply at your earliest convenience, and am yours, &c.

JOHN CLARK.

*3, Portland-place, Everton, near Liverpool,
20th October, 1840.*

My Dear Sir,—I, this morning, was favoured with your letter of yesterday, and in reply beg to state that I am truly surprised that any Society, especially one which assumes to itself the character of a Church association, should believe that any man is capable of diving into the inward thoughts of any soul, and thus constituting himself “a discernor of spirits.” Were I to obtain such a testimonial as you think the Society will require, what would it amount to after all? Why just to this—that as far as the writer thereof knew, I was a spiritually-minded and devoted man. Now how is it possible for any man to assert this with truth, excepting in as far as he can judge of my frame of mind by my outward actions? And to these I think the testimonials which have been already forwarded to the Pastoral Aid Society, bear ample testimony. If I did not conceive that I were inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost so to do, I should consider that I was committing an actual sin by applying to be admitted to holy orders. I trust that, as far as I know my own heart, I am spiritually-minded—at any rate I endeavour to live under the influences of that blessed Spirit, who, at my baptism, took up his abode within me. As to my devotedness, I can sincerely say that I am prepared to spend and be spent in the service of the Church, which I believe to be the kingdom of God upon earth, and into which it shall be my constant endeavour to bring all those who have strayed from the true fold of Christ Jesus the Lord. It is my determination to preach not only the *great* truths of the gospel, but the *whole* truth as it is in Jesus; and, whilst I shall make it my study to set forth in all its fulness the atoning sacrifice of Christ, I shall not fail to impress upon my hearers

the observance of the divine admonition—"If ye love me, keep my commandments." I shall make it my constant care to instil into the minds of my congregation the awful nature of the sin of schism, to show them the evil which they contract by not avoiding those "which cause divisions among them," and to lay before them the great benefits attending a worthy receiving of the holy sacraments, which they neither do nor can participate in when in a state of separation from the Church.

To you, as to a minister of God, I have no objection to make his confession, though I might refuse to do so to a Lay Society. I shall be glad if you will let me know the result of this matter as soon as you conveniently can. And I am, my dear Sir, yours, ever faithfully,

T. BRIARLY BROWNE.

Rev. John Clark.

Hunslet, Nov. 4, 1840.

Rev. Sir,—According to your request I forwarded to you, by post, on the 26th of last month, a letter from Mr. Browne, respecting the testimonial as to his "Christian character and qualifications;" at the same time requesting an answer from you at the earliest convenient opportunity. Not having heard from you, I now write to request your decision respecting Mr. Browne's receiving the grant of 80*l.* per annum, voted by the Pastoral Aid Society for the Pottery Fields district.—Yours, &c.

JOHN CLARK.

Temple Chambers, Nov. 4, 1840.

Rev. Sir,—I have laid Mr. Browne's testimonials before the Clerical Members of the committee, and am directed by them to inform you that they cannot give their sanction to your nomination of Mr. Browne—I am, Rev. Sir, yours faithfully,

E. B. WERE, Sec. C.P.A.S.

Hunslet, Nov. 7th, 1840.

Reverend Sir,—I have to request that you will send me Mr. Browne's letter and testimonials at your earliest convenience.

As it appears to me that the Pastoral Aid Society obtains support under false pretences, it is my intention to publish our correspondence.—I have the honour to be, Rev. Sir, your obedient humble servant,

JOHN CLARK.

*Temple Chambers, Falcon Court, Fleet-street,
Nov. 9, 1840.*

Rev. Sir,—In reply to your communication of the 7th instant, beg to state, that agreeably to your request, I have enclosed to

you Mr. Browne's letter and testimonials. With respect to the last part of your communication, in which you not very courteously accuse the Society of "obtaining support under false pretences," and announce your intention of publishing the correspondence which has taken place on the subject of Mr. Browne's nomination,—I have only to observe, that the Society is quite prepared to maintain its principles and practice, should it deem it necessary to do so. I must request that you will have the candour to publish, along with the other letter, Mr. Browne's communication, which came before the members of the clerical committee in the form of a testimonial, and which had the effect very materially of deciding the judgment of those members. In the very first sentence of that letter there is evidently a sneer at the character of the Society. For what else could Mr. Browne mean by talking of the Society as one "which assumed to itself the character of a *Church* association?"

Could any one, after such an expression of Mr. Browne's real sentiments, be so simple as to imagine that the friends of the Society would sanction the appointment of a gentleman who evidently despised it? If, then, there were no other reason for refusing to confirm Mr. Browne's nomination, is not this, I would ask, amply sufficient? Allow me to say, moreover, that this fact more than justifies us in not acquiescing at once in the appointment of the gentleman in question, and in requiring further evidence as to his character and qualifications.

If we had not done so, we should not have had the opportunity of perusing his letter, in which he expresses his contemptuous feelings towards the Society, which he does not scruple, in another part of his letter, to stigmatize as a "*Lay Society*." With what consistency Mr. Browne, or yourself, could apply for aid to such a Society, I leave you to determine; and only requesting that you will publish this letter with the rest of the correspondence, I remain, Rev. Sir, yours faithfully,

ELLIS B. WERE, Sec. Ch. P. A. S.

(B.)

The following three extracts, from the *Liverpool Standard*, defending the Pastoral Aid Society against the charges in the foregoing correspondence, are cited as tolerably plain proofs, that in the opinion not only of its opponents, but also of its advocates, it in practice is not, as it professes, a comprehensive Church Society, but a bigoted, sectarian, and insidious Society, for the exclusive purposes of the party in the Church denominated "*Evangelical*."

Extract 1. presents an edifying specimen of the operation of this *vague* test of the Pastoral Aid Society on the character of the candidates, and upon the estimate to be formed by its friends of the veracity of beneficed clergymen, testifying solemnly to that character. The *italics* are those of the *Liverpool Standard*.

Extract 1.

“ One of the clergymen who signed Mr. Browne’s testimonials, certifies, that he ‘ had known him for a considerable time, and that he *believed* his life and conversation to be such as became a minister of the Gospel, and that his views and doctrines were in *accordance with the articles and homilies of the Church.*’ Another clergyman states, that ‘ he had known Mr. Browne about five years,’ and that ‘ *he believed* him to be a strictly conscientious man, and a devoted admirer and supporter of the ritual of the Church,’ and that ‘ he had no doubt but that he would exert himself diligently in any sphere of usefulness to which he might be appointed.’ A third clergyman expresses himself much to the same effect. He says, that he ‘ had *every reason to believe*, that Mr. Browne would prove himself qualified for the holy office he sought, having made it his study to become thoroughly acquainted with the doctrines and discipline of the Church,’ and that ‘ *he thought* Mr. Browne was fully alive to the responsibilities of the ministry, and anxious to devote himself to the laborious duties of the curacy’ to which he might be appointed. We have extracted all the material points in these letters of recommendation. These testimonials, at least the first and second, were countersigned by the Bishop of Chester, who merely states that the parties signing them were ‘ beneficed clergy in the diocese of Chester, and worthy of credit.’ ”

Now the plain English of all this is, that because the managers of the Pastoral Aid Society, in the plenitude of their super-papal authority, have thought fit to declare, that *they* are not satisfied that Mr. Browne is “ spiritual-minded,” therefore, that gentleman is an impostor, and the four respected incumbents, in the most *solemn and responsible* act of testifying to the bishop, are guilty of the meanest and grossest *equivocation*. For this is evidently insinuated by printing “ *believed,*” “ *thought,*” &c. in italics, in the foregoing paragraph. But not only is he unfit for the *ministry*; he is no better than a heathen; he is actually pronounced “ unconverted.” This will be seen in the next extract, in which the italics of the *Liverpool Standard* are given.

Extract 2.

‘ The Pastoral Aid Society requires more than this *vague* and

indefinite sort of testimony. It requires to be assured, that the candidates *submitted* to its notice are, as far as human judgment is cognisant of the matter, *converted characters*, anxious to become instrumental in the conversion of others, and that with a single eye to the glory of God. Nothing short of this, with the superaddition of the requisite degree of general learning, *ought to satisfy* the Pastoral Aid Society, or any other Society similarly constituted."

Hence we are to understand, that notwithstanding the testimonies of four beneficed clergymen, declared by the bishop "worthy of credit," to the fact of Mr. Browne's having lived as "*becomes a Christian minister*," that his "*creed and doctrines were in accordance with the articles and homilies of the Church*," a "*conscientious man*," "*qualified for the holy office*," has studied the "*doctrine and discipline of the Church*," and is "*imbued with its spirit*," yet the society is to *doubt* whether he is CONVERTED! Is not this monstrous? Are these Church principles? Is such a tribunal of intolerance and sectarianism to stand forth and collect money, and to be advocated in our pulpits as a *Church Society*?

Extract 3.

This is an open and unblushing statement that Episcopacy is to be put at once on the shelf, and the grand inquisition of the Pastoral Aid Society to supersede the whole Bench. This advocate of the Society deserves public thanks for his plain speaking. Here there is no mistake:

"Unless Mr. Clark can prove that all the bishops of the Church of England, including the recent *Whig creations* (we mean no disrespect to the Bishop of Ripon, whom we believe to be a pious and devoted prelate), are men who themselves '*preach fully and faithfully the great truths of the Gospel*;' he has no right to assume that the previous episcopal sanction given to the testimonials of a candidate ought to satisfy the Pastoral Aid Society."

So that unless Mr. Clark can prove that the whole bench of Bishops are "*Evangelicals*" (for that is evidently the meaning, "*preach fully*," &c. &c.), then their sanction to the testimonials, and the order of the Church in that matter, is to be treated with utter contempt. It were better at once to appoint the Pastoral Aid Society in their place. Ride on, gentlemen! proclaim yourselves a Church Society! Churchmen! lend your pulpits; give your money! shut your eyes and ears! make a party the Church, and all the Bishops "*converted*" *Evangelicals*!

Extract 4.

No glass ever reflected a truer image of the object than this

passage does of the sentiments of a rabid, prejudiced, and intolerant *sectarian*.

"No orthodox member of the Church of England can do otherwise than commend the Pastoral Aid Society for the course which it has taken in the matter. When we use the term '*orthodox*,' we, of course, *exclude* the Puseyite heresiarchs, whose doctrines are diametrically opposed to the sound *evangelical* articles and homilies and other formularies of the Church of England."

Now having exhibited this advocate of the Pastoral Aid Society as a good *portrait of sectarian* rancour, exclusion, and prejudice, an *original* shall be placed beside it, and the public can judge of the *likeness*. The following are the words of an *avowed dissenter*, who, it must be allowed, is at least more honest and consistent, if not more charitable, in his abuse of the ministers of a Church, which he does not profess to revere, than the Pastoral Aid advocate, who is heaping the same abuse on a Church, which he *professes* to uphold.

"How many preach Puseyism whose lives proclaim them to be mere men of the world; who, finding it the way to preferment, are ascetics in their sermons and prayers, but the very opposite in their conduct; the *fair samples* of a clergy who substitute baptismal regeneration for personal holiness. We should not be surprised if the *worthy clergy of a state-endowed church*, who have a sufficient degree of intellect to enable them to think and to manufacture sophisms, were to become the ready disciples of the Oxford tractators. The Church, we are told, is awake; *that is, the clergy*, and they must do something. *Holy, in the nature of things, they cannot be*; but there is another way; they may be *sanctimonious* Puseyites—they may hug the crucifix, and hate the cross; they may deceive the people by cant and grimace, and call it devotion. The time has arrived when an outward decency must be assumed to conceal the want of piety; those who loathe religion in their hearts would be glad to have a specious semblance instead of the reality. *The priests are ready and eager to supply them with the counterfeit.*"

The Editor of the *British Magazine* observes upon this choice specimen of sectarian candour and charity:

"This is '*the Evangelical Magazine*,' and one certainly does like such plain speaking better than the heartless cant about 'our dear brethren of the establishment.' It is better that feelings should be plainly expressed and fully understood!"

These avowed enemies hoist their true colours; they do not approach us as friends; they do not profess to be *Churchmen*, and then assault the ministers of the Church. They leave that to the Pastoral Aid advocate.

We will not, however, be hard upon the Editor of the *Liverpool Standard*, and affirm that he really is a Dissenter, to whose worst features he has presented a resemblance so striking. He is believed to be well-intentioned to the Church, and possibly is; but he has got woefully out of his depth, in the non-sensical chorus about *Puseyites*, in which he has joined with rancorous Dissenters, and against the clergy of that Church. We may charitably presume that he is utterly sinless of ever having looked into Dr. Pusey's writings, or of knowing any thing at all about the matter beyond what he catches up from ignorant slanderers of the Oxford Tract writers. I am not concerned to defend them; but this much I will affirm, that among them are some of the most scriptural, learned, pious and single-minded Christians and pastors that any Church can boast of; and though I may not agree with them in all things, I should feel ashamed of myself, and know that I was far from the spirit of Christ, if I reviled them, or arrogantly pronounced them 'unconverted.' Instead of being heresiarchs, they are the mightiest champions of the existence and privileges of the Christian Church universal, and against all heresy, whether sectarian or Romanist. Upon the *principles* of sectarianism, whether within or without the Church, the Romanist would press these '*converted*' men with arguments which they would be mightily puzzled to answer. But this is foreign to the present purpose. I have adduced strong cases, collected *with ease*, against the Society. I now lay myself out for them; and *request* those clergy who have been in similar circumstances with regard to the Pastoral Aid Society, to send me in their cases (*postage pre-paid*), and the documents supporting them.

The Church must be on the alert. The *Additional Curates' Society* must be *vigorously* supported, and the distinctions between it and the Pastoral Aid Society *extensively* made known; and the Clergy must be *cautioned* against lending *their pulpits* to the *designs* of the latter, till it shall have purged itself of its party leaven and its insidious conditions. It must be urged to do this for the sake of the Church, and even for the sake of its own usefulness and character. If it does not, every *Churchman* belonging to it should withdraw his support, and transfer that support to the *liberal* and *truly Church* SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CURATES.

CONCLUSION.

To prevent misapprehension or misstatement, I give a brief summary of what I have, and what I have *not*, attempted to establish.

I do not question the right of the Society to *impose its own conditions*; but I do question its right (having such conditions)

to be considered or supported as a *Church* Society—I regard it as a *party* Society.

I do *not* affirm that those conditions were *designed*, but that they are *adapted*, and have been *worked*, to party purposes.

I do *not* charge the *whole Society* with working it, or knowing it to be worked, for such purposes; but I do charge the *Managers* with having so worked it.

I do not charge the Society with superseding the Bishop, by suffering his approval to be *first* expressed, and then disregarded because they differ from him; but with making their own special approval a “*sine qua non*”—thus putting *themselves in the place of both Bishop and Incumbent*, to whom the “*order of the Church*” has committed the judgment of this matter. I do not charge the Society with *claiming* the right to nominate Curates, but with using its *veto* so as to render its promise of leaving that right to the Incumbent a deception.

I affirm that, so long as the Society retains that obnoxious condition, it must foment discord, and act against both the order of the Church, and the comprehensive spirit of its Articles.

Since writing the foregoing letter, I have learned, that friends of the Pastoral Aid Society have given up the *Manchester Courier* and the *Manchester Chronicle*, because their respective editors have *dared to express an opinion* upon the question. Will these intolerant attempts to crush discussion, tend to mitigate the suspicion and jealousy which the correspondence alluded to has awakened?

THE END.

In 2 vols. price 1l.

Dr. MOLESWORTH'S DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN; or, Sermons on Family Duties, for every Sunday in the Year.

Also,

REMARKS on CHURCH RATES, and the ROCHDALE CONTEST. Price 9d.

A LETTER TO THE REV. CALEB WHITEFOORD, on the Unworthy Acts by which he and others have attempted to screen the PASTORAL AID SOCIETY, and divert Public attention from the distinct Charges and Evidences adduced against it in the "Letter to the Bishop of Chester." By J. E. N. MOLESWORTH, D.D., Vicar of Rochdale. Price 6d.

THE PULPIT COMPANION, and Numerous other Works, by the same Author, may be had at Messrs. RIVINGTON's, St. Paul's Church Yard, and Waterloo Place, London.





